



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,425	05/15/2001	Scott Krueger	27813.010300	8968

7590 10/22/2003
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
885 Third Avenue, 21st Fl.
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

YIGDALL, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/855,425

Applicant(s)

KRUEGER ET AL.

Examiner

Michael J. Yigdall

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 14-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s):

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2122

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 are pending and have been examined. The date of priority considered for the application is 15 May 2000.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because they are informally drawn by hand. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "step" in line 3 should be replaced with --steps--, and the phrase "said herder" in line 6 should be replaced with --said header--. Appropriate correction is required. The claim has been interpreted assuming these corrections to be made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,026,235 to Shaughnessy.

With respect to claim 26, Shaughnessy discloses a method for intercepting a software call to a function contained in a dynamically linked library (see column 4, lines 14-27) comprising the steps of:

(a) obtaining from an operating system by an intercepting program the address of an executable program (see column 9, lines 11-19, which shows obtaining address information from an executable program);

(b) locating in a header of the executable program a list of libraries and functions called by the executable program (see step 301 of Fig. 3, and column 10, lines 19-27; note that an import table of an executable program is considered a header);

(c) substituting a function reference in an import table of the executable program with a reference to a function in a library of the intercepting program (see step 303 of Fig 3, and column 12, lines 52-55, which shows replacing function references in an executable with stubs); and

(d) storing said function reference in an internal memory structure (see step 302 of Fig. 3, and column 11, lines 31-34, which shows building tables of all function references; see also column 11, lines 47-62, which shows the data structure used for the tables).

With respect to claim 27, Shaughnessy discloses the method of claim 26, wherein said executable program header includes an import table, further comprising examining the import table in order to locate the list of libraries and functions called by the executable program (see step 301 of Fig. 3, and column 10, lines 19-27).

With respect to claim 28, Shaughnessy discloses the method of claim 26, wherein the function reference is an ordinal number (see column 10, lines 25-27, which shows that the table

Art Unit: 2122

of function references is sorted by address, placing the references in order such that they could be identified by number).

With respect to claim 29, Shaughnessy discloses the method of claim 26, wherein the function reference is a name (see column 10, lines 25-27, which shows that the table of function references is sorted by name).

With respect to claim 30, Shaughnessy discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising:

(e) obtaining the address of a library, said library including an import table (see column 9, lines 11-19, which shows obtaining address information from the import table of a shared library); and

(f) substituting a function reference in the import table of the library with a reference to a function in a library of the intercepting program (see step 303 of Fig 3, and column 12, lines 52-55, which shows replacing function references in a dynamic-link library with stubs).

With respect to claim 31, Shaughnessy discloses the method of claim 30, wherein the library address is obtained from the operating system (see column 9, lines 11-19, which shows obtaining address information from operating system debug info).

With respect to claim 32, Shaughnessy discloses the method of claim 30, wherein the library address is obtained from the import table of the executable (see column 9, lines 11-19, which shows obtaining address information from an import table).

With respect to claim 33, Shaughnessy discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising replacing the address of an API function in the import table of the executable with the address of a function of the intercepting program (see column 12, lines 52-55, which shows

Art Unit: 2122

replacing a function call address with a stub address; see also column 11, lines 31-34, which shows that stubs are created for all known functions, including API functions), said function having a return value comprising a table of addresses of one or more functions, wherein the intercepting program function inspects the table of addresses returned by the API function and inserts one or more substitute function addresses into the table of addresses (see column 11, lines 34-41, which shows that the return address of the function is noted and then replaced with a substitute address).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,185,681 to Zizzi in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,611,878 to De Armas et al.

With respect to claim 1, Zizzi discloses a method for associating the activity of an application with the graphical display of the file on a screen (see the title and abstract). Zizzi does not disclose the steps of:

(a) loading by an operating system an executable code of a message monitoring program adapted to monitoring a message sent by an operating system to a document display window;

(b) establishing by the message monitoring program a system-wide window hook using available operating system API functions, said system-wide window hook associated with one or more functions in a library of said message monitoring program;

(c) loading the message monitoring program library into the memory space of an application program, said application having been newly started and having an import table and a newly created window;

(d) fixing the import table of the application with addresses of functions from the message monitoring program library; and

(e) substituting the application's main window function with a message monitoring program window function.

Zizzi does show trapping event messages related to opening and closing documents sent to or from an application (see column 8, lines 32-42, and column 9, lines 44-54), for the purpose of enabling transparent document manipulation (see the title and abstract).

De Armas et al. disclose step (a) above in terms of a technology injection system, a program that monitors and intercepts all messages sent by an operating system to an application window (see column 5, lines 26-49).

De Armas et al. further disclose step (b) above (see column 7, lines 56-63, which shows using an operating system API function to establish a system-wide hook for monitoring and intercepting messages).

De Armas et al. further disclose steps (c), (d) and (e) above by first locating the memory space of an application with the address of its window function, and then replacing this address

with a pointer to a substitute window function from the program library of the technology injection system (see column 8, lines 35-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Zizzi with the steps taught by De Armas et al., for the purpose of seamlessly integrating new functionality into an existing program (see De Armas et al., column 2, lines 40-44).

With respect to claim 2, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. discloses the method of claim 1. Zizzi does not show the step of creating a key window when an application is started, said key window adapted to receive a message when a file is opened and closed.

De Armas et al. disclose the step above in terms of creating and using a surrogate window that receives messages from an application (see column 9, lines 5-17; note that any message sent from the operating system to the application will be routed to the surrogate window, including messages for opening and closing files).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Zizzi with the step taught by De Armas et al., for the purpose of seamlessly integrating new functionality into an existing program (see De Armas et al., column 2, lines 40-44).

With respect to claim 5, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising, upon receipt of a document window destroy message by a document's notify window, checking for the existence of a child notify window associated with a file that was opened in association with said document, and acting upon said associated file before destroying said document window (see Zizzi, column 8, lines 32-42, which shows the receipt of event

messages, including the “close” message that would destroy a document window; see also column 8, lines 59-67, and column 9, lines 1-7, which show checking whether the document window, a client or child of the document management system, should be acted upon; see also column 9, lines 8-16 and 32-38, which shows acting upon the file before it is closed).

With respect to claim 25, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. discloses the method of claim 1. Zizzi does not show the step of monitoring by the message monitoring program window function the creating of a document child window.

De Armas et al. disclose the step above in terms of a technology injection system, a program that monitors and intercepts all messages sent by an operating system to an application window (see column 5, lines 26-49; note that all messages are intercepted, including those for creating document child windows).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Zizzi with the step taught by De Armas et al., for the purpose of seamlessly integrating new functionality into an existing program (see De Armas et al., column 2, lines 40-44).

8. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. as applied to claims 1, 2, 5 and 25 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,604,150 to Gebhart et al.

With respect to claim 3, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. discloses the method of claim 2, but does not show the steps of:

- (a) sending a message to the key window when a file is opened;
- (b) creating a child notify window associated with said file; and

(c) creating a notify window as a child window of a document window associated with said file.

Gebhart et al. disclose the steps above (see Fig. 5B, which shows sending messages to a key window, such as an open file message from an application; see also Figs. 1 and 2, and column 5, lines 58-64, which show creating a dialog or notify window as a child window of a document window), for the purpose of integrating application extensions into a graphical user interface (see the title and abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Zizzi with the steps taught by Gebhart et al., for the purpose of integrating application extensions into a graphical user interface.

With respect to claim 4, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. discloses the method of claim 1, but does not show the steps of:

(a) creating a notify window when a document window is created, wherein the notify window is a child window of the document window; and

(b) receiving by the notify window a message from the operating system when the parent document window is activated by either the application program or by the action of a user.

Gebhart et al. disclose the steps above (see Figs. 1 and 2, and column 5, lines 58-64, which show creating a dialog or notify window as a child window of a document window; see also column 6, lines 3-30, which shows that the dialog or notify window receives messages from the application and from the actions of a user), for the purpose of integrating application extensions into a graphical user interface (see the title and abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Zizzi with the steps taught by Gebhart et al., for the purpose of integrating application extensions into a graphical user interface.

9. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. as applied to claims 1, 2, 5 and 25 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,699,428 to McDonnal et al.

With respect to claim 6, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. discloses the method of claim 5, but does not show the limitation comprising a user of an application specifying one or more rules to the application, each said rule indicating an action to be taken on said associated file before destroying said document window.

Zizzi does show checking a file with a set of tests to determine whether or not the document should be acted upon (see column 8, lines 43-48).

McDonnal et al. disclose the limitation above in terms of a rule file that is used to define the action to be taken on a document based on the user and other parameters (see column 8, lines 35-49), for the purpose of enabling automatic decryption and encryption in response to file open and close events (see the abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the features of McDonnal et al. to enable automatic rule-based encryption and decryption, as taught by McDonnal et al.

With respect to claim 7, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, wherein an action includes encrypting said associated file. Zizzi does not show the limitation wherein encrypting comprises the steps of:

(a) creating a new file containing a template of the same format as said associated file, said new file including a header, wherein said header is not encrypted;

(b) copying to the new file a document summary in readable form;

(c) copying to the new file visual indicia representing that the file is encrypted;

(d) copying encrypted data from the associated file to the new file as a named stream, said encrypted data having a beginning and a length; and

(e) writing a code to a substitute stream to prevent the new file from being written over by a user.

McDonnal et al. disclose step (a) above (see column 28, lines 51-55, which shows creating a new file based on an associated file; see also column 29, lines 7-12, which shows including a security label in the new file; see also column 17, lines 48-49, which shows that the security label is a header).

McDonnal et al. further disclose step (b) above in terms of copying summary data about a document to its security label (see column 18, lines 7-18, which shows that the summary information includes the type of encryption algorithm used on the document and a list of authorized users).

McDonnal et al. further disclose step (c) above (see column 17, lines 64-67, which shows that the presence of a security label indicates that a file is encrypted).

McDonnal et al. further disclose step (d) above (see column 29, lines 12-18, which shows copying encrypted data to a new file from an associated file; note that this data inherently has a beginning and a length).

McDonnal et al. further disclose step (e) above (see column 19, lines 42-55, which shows using a unique, substitute file name so that data is not overwritten).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the features of McDonnal et al., for the reason taught by McDonnal et al., which is to enable automatic decryption and encryption in response to file open and close events (see the abstract).

With respect to claim 8, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 7. Zizzi does not show the step of including in the header a flag indicative of the type of encryption used on the associated file.

Zizzi does show several types of encryption techniques (see column 3, lines 27-51).

McDonnal et al. disclose the step above for the purpose of later determining the algorithm to use for decrypting a file (see column 18, lines 7-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the flag indicating the encryption type, for the reason taught by McDonnal et al., which is to later determine the proper algorithm.

With respect to claim 9, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 7. Zizzi does not show the step of including in the header a flag indicative of a handling procedure to be used on the associated file.

Zizzi does show obtaining an encryption key associated with a document, which establishes the procedure to be used on the file (see column 9, lines 17-22).

McDonnal et al. disclose the step above in terms of an encryption key stored in the security label of a file, which is needed to determine the procedure for handling the file (see column 18, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the feature of McDonnal et al., in order to determine from its header the proper handling procedure to use on a file.

10. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. as applied to claims 6-9 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,757,908 to Cooper et al.

With respect to claim 10, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 7. Zizzi does not show the step of loading data from the encrypted file into a memory block containing other random data, said memory block having a beginning, wherein an offset from the beginning of the memory block of the data from the encrypted file changes each time the message monitoring program executable code is loaded.

Cooper et al. show the step above for the purpose of securing access to files (see column 3, lines 50-63, which shows that data from an encrypted file is copied to memory; note that the memory inherently contains other random data, and that the offset from the beginning of the memory to the location of the encrypted data inherently changes).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the features of Cooper et al. for the purpose of securing access to files.

With respect to claim 11, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 7. Zizzi does not show the step of including in the header a flag indicative of the length of the encrypted data, and a flag that allows the message monitoring program to search for the beginning of the encrypted data.

Cooper et al. show the step above in terms of an encryption header in a system for securing files (see Fig. 24 and column 17, lines 17-34, which shows a header field for the offset to a side file, i.e. a flag indicating the beginning of encrypted data; see also Fig. 26 and column 18, lines 57-65, which shows a header field for the length of a side file, i.e. a flag indicating the length of encrypted data), for the purpose of keeping the size of the encrypted file the same as the size of the original file (see column 17, lines 12-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the encryption header feature, for the reason taught by Cooper et al., which is to maintain a particular file size.

11. Claims 14, 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. as applied to claims 6-9 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,310 to Arrouye et al.

With respect to claim 14, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes compressing said associated file.

Arrouye et al. disclose the limitation above (see item 30 of Fig. 1, and column 4, lines 38-51, which show compressing and decompressing files) in a system for transparently transforming objects so that they can be used by applications (see the title and abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the feature of Arrouye et al. so that applications can use nonnative files, as taught by Arrouye et al.

With respect to claim 16, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes converting said associated file into another file format.

Arrouye et al. disclose the limitation above (see item 26 of Fig. 1, and column 4, lines 5-21, which show converting files to other formats) in a system for transparently transforming objects so that they can be used by applications (see the title and abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the feature of Arrouye et al. so that applications can use nonnative files, as taught by Arrouye et al.

With respect to claim 23, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes storing said associated file content in a remote location, and storing a reference of said associated file locally.

Arrouye et al. disclose the limitation above (see item 28 of Fig. 1, and column 4, lines 22-37, which show retrieving files from remote locations) in a system for transparently transforming objects so that they can be used by applications (see the title and abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the feature of Arrouye et al. so that applications can use nonnative files, as taught by Arrouye et al.

12. Claims 15, 18, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. as applied to claims 6-9 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,884,246 to Boucher et al.

With respect to claim 15, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes translating said associated file into another language.

Boucher et al. disclose the limitation above in terms of a system for transparently translating messages into other languages (see column 2, lines 7-15) for the purpose of enhancing electronic communications (see column 1, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the translation feature, for the reason taught by Boucher et al., which is to enhance communications.

With respect to claim 18, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes altering text in said associated file.

Boucher et al. disclose the limitation above in terms of a system for transparently translating messages into other languages (see column 12, lines 17-26, which shows altering text in the message or file by removing certain portions) for the purpose of enhancing electronic communications (see column 1, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the text-altering feature, for the reason taught by Boucher et al., which is to enhance communications.

With respect to claim 20, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes spell checking said associated file.

Boucher et al. disclose the limitation above in terms of a system for transparently translating messages into other languages (see column 12, lines 15-17, which shows spell checking the message or file) for the purpose of enhancing electronic communications (see column 1, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the spell-checking feature, for the reason taught by Boucher et al., which is to enhance communications.

With respect to claim 24, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes grammar checking said associated file.

Boucher et al. disclose the limitation above in terms of a system for transparently translating messages into other languages (see column 12, lines 15-17, which shows grammar checking the message or file) for the purpose of enhancing electronic communications (see column 1, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the grammar-checking feature, for the reason taught by Boucher et al., which is to enhance communications.

13. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. as applied to claims 6-9 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,956,481 to Walsh et al.

With respect to claim 17, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes searching for a virus in said associated file.

Walsh et al. disclose the limitation above in terms of a virus protection system (see column 10, lines 17-34, which shows that documents are scanned when a file event is detected) used to warn users about potential viruses (see column 10, lines 35-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the feature of Walsh et al. for the purpose of warning users about potential viruses.

With respect to claim 19, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes changing or adding an optional setting to said associated file.

Walsh et al. disclose the limitation above in terms of a virus protection system (see column 11, lines 16-26, which shows changing the read only setting of a file) used to prevent the spread of viruses (see column 11, lines 26-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the feature of Walsh et al. for the purpose of preventing the spread of viruses.

14. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. as applied to claims 6-9 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,629,109 to Koshisaka.

With respect to claim 21, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes creating a backup of said associated file.

Koshisaka discloses the limitation above in terms of monitoring system messages and generating backup files (see column 2, lines 5-21) for the purpose of enabling revision and backup management in applications without such features (see column 1, lines 58-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the features of Koshisaka in order to integrate revision and backup management into other applications.

With respect to claim 22, Zizzi in view of De Armas et al. in view of McDonnal et al. discloses the method of claim 6, but does not show the limitation wherein an action includes versioning said associated file under a different name or stream each time said associated file is saved.

Koshisaka discloses the limitation above in terms of monitoring system messages and generating backup files (see column 2, lines 5-21; see also Fig. 4, which shows that different file names are used when files are manipulated) for the purpose of enabling revision and backup management in applications without such features (see column 1, lines 58-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zizzi with the features of Koshisaka in order to integrate revision and backup management into other applications.

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Pat. No. 6,141,698 to Krishnan et al. discloses a system for modifying the functionality of existing applications by injecting new code into executable files. U.S. Pat. No. 6,115,039 to Karren et al. discloses a method for creating and working with windows using messages. U.S. Pat. No. 6,263,488 to Fortin et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,872,976 to Yee et al., and U.S. Pat. No. 5,551,037 to Fowler et al. disclose systems and methods for monitoring function calls, events and messages.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Yigdall whose telephone number is (703) 305-0352. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2122

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

MY

Michael J. Yigdall
Examiner
Art Unit 2122

mjy
October 9, 2003

John Chavis

JOHN CHAVIS
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2124